

1 [Parties and Counsel Listed on Signature Pages]
2
3
4
5

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT
ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:

ALL ACTIONS

MDL No. 3047

Case No. 4:22-md-03047-YGR (PHK)

**JOINT STATUS REPORT ON FORENSIC
IMAGING AND DEVICE DATA**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Peter H. Kang

1 Pursuant to Discovery Management Order No. 8 (“DMO No. 8”), the Parties jointly provide this
 2 Report on Plaintiffs’ progress in identifying and producing data from certain of Plaintiffs’ devices
 3 (hereinafter “Main Devices”),¹ as well as the Parties’ progress in conferring on certain other topics as
 4 directed by the Court.

5 **I. Search Terms & Word Searchable Databases**

6 On June 19, 2024, Plaintiffs provided Defendants with a list of proposed search terms to apply to
 7 all email, text messages and other word searchable data. *See* Hrg. Tr. at 34–35, 38. Plaintiffs are currently
 8 evaluating the use of Plaintiff specific search terms and intend to discuss same with Defendants during
 9 the Parties next meet and confer. Following argument on the forensic inspection protocol and the Court’s
 10 oral rulings on July 11, Defendants provided additional proposed search terms to Plaintiffs on July 19.
 11 Defendants further requested hit reports related to usage of the search terms, so that they could be refined.
 12 Plaintiffs are evaluating Defendants’ proposed terms and request for hit reports. Plaintiffs expect to
 13 respond to Defendants’ proposed terms by August 2, if not sooner.

14 **Defendants Additional Statement:**

15 Defendants respectfully request that the Court order the following schedule to facilitate production
 16 of documents so that depositions may commence given the compressed discovery schedule in this case:

- 17 • Plaintiffs respond to Defendants’ proposed search terms by July 31, including by
 18 providing hit reports;
- 19 • Plaintiffs propose any additional case-specific search terms for each bellwether Plaintiff
 20 by July 31;
- 21 • Defendants respond with any additional search terms by August 2; and

22
 23
 24
 25 ¹ The Parties use the term “Main Devices” to refer to the Court’s definition in DMO 8 of devices from
 26 which information will be initially produced: “[A]ll devices (cellphones, tablets, laptops, computers,
 27 and the like) which are in each Bellwether PI Plaintiff’s possession, custody, or control and that they
 28 have habitually, routinely, or regularly used during the relevant time period to access the Defendants’
 platforms.” Order at 8:24–9:25; Hrg. Tr. 45:19–21.

1 • The parties conclude negotiations over search terms by August 6 and report to the Court
 2 on finalized search terms and any disputes in connection with the August 8 Discovery
 3 Management Conference.

4 **Plaintiffs' Additional Statement:**

5 Though Plaintiffs agree with the sentiment of Defendants' position, and will continue to work in
 6 good faith to conclude search term negotiations as quickly as possible, Plaintiffs disagree with Defendants'
 7 insistence on utilizing the Joint Status Report as a forum to air any and all discovery grievances that are
 8 unripe, are only tangentially attached to central issue of producing the file-system level device data, and
 9 which unnecessarily complicate and frustrate meaningful reporting on the actual task of producing
 10 relevant device data.

11 As such, Plaintiffs' respectfully ask the Court for an Order providing specific parameters for these
 12 Status Reports to ensure the Parties' updates are focused on demonstrating meaningful progress toward
 13 the production of this device data as expeditiously as possible.

14 **II. Inventory of Devices and Forensic Imaging**

15 In DMO 8, the Court ordered Plaintiffs, among other things, to "produce a list of every model
 16 number of every relevant Bellwether PI Plaintiffs' device.... Said list of devices must be correlated by
 17 individual Bellwether PI Plaintiff. Further, the PI Plaintiffs are **ORDERED** to provide a full list and chart
 18 to the Defendants of all the applications which are currently on the relevant Bellwether PI Plaintiffs'
 19 devices." July 19, 2024 Order, Doc. 1025 at 5:23-6:5.

20 The Court noted that Plaintiffs were to identify all of Plaintiffs devices, including old devices, and
 21 their make and model numbers "so we have a complete universe of what the devices are." Hrg. Tr. 28-
 22 29, 40, 42; Order at 5:23-24. Plaintiffs were to include a description of the Main Devices' features, and
 23 the way in which those features are logged or included in specific databases. *Id.* Moreover, the Court
 24 ordered Plaintiffs to provide this information in "a list" or "table" "correlated by individual Bellwether
 25 Plaintiff." *See generally* Order at 5-6; Hrg. Tr. at 46.

1 **Status Report:**

2 The Parties report the following progress on production of the device and image identifying
3 information:

4

- 5 • On July 15, Defendants sent Plaintiffs a draft Status Report Table pre-populated with
information listing each of the types of devices that were identified in the Plaintiff Fact
Sheets. *See Appendix A.*
- 6
- 7 • On July 19, Plaintiffs produced some device identifying information and app lists for 23
of the 27 Main Devices identified by Plaintiffs thus far in a separate table. Plaintiffs
relied to Defendants that 4 devices missing this information are in Plaintiffs' possession
but are currently inaccessible due to technical issues, and that Plaintiffs' counsel are
working with their clients and experts to find a solution, and will supply the missing
information as soon as Plaintiffs are able to for those devices.
- 8
- 9 • The Parties met and conferred regarding Plaintiffs' July 19 table and device identifying
information missing for multiple Plaintiffs on July 24.
- 10
- 11 • On July 24, Plaintiffs provided two additional tables one with lists of installed programs
for two laptops that were obtained after the initial status report deadline on July 19 and
another to reflect changes in PFS responses concerning some Routine Devices.
- 12
- 13 • For the Court's reference, Appendix A includes all identifying information provided by
Plaintiffs pertaining to the devices and imaging of the devices.

14

15 There is still missing identifying information, as indicated in Appendix A. Plaintiffs' July 19 table
16 included information for all "Main Devices," that were known to Plaintiffs' counsel as of that date, and
17 counsel has reserved the right to supplement to include any additional Main Devices Plaintiffs may locate.
18 Defendants lack information regarding the dates Plaintiffs used those devices, without which Defendants
19 cannot evaluate whether it is a complete list of all Main Devices for the Relevant Time Period (as defined
20 in the PFS and Defendants' Request for Production Set Two). Defendants have asked Plaintiffs to provide
21 all information missing from Appendix A.

22

23 Plaintiffs have provided responses to Interrogatories for some Bellwether Plaintiffs with some
24 information regarding devices Plaintiffs recall using to access Defendants' platforms and the associated
25 dates of use and current knowledge of location and possession of the device.

26

27 Defendants have asked for a comprehensive chart of this data, and Plaintiffs have agreed to pull
28 together in chart or table format the devices Plaintiffs recall using to access platforms and the associated
date range of use, that Plaintiffs provided to Defendants previously in their interrogatory responses.

1 Should any of the Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses be discovered to be incomplete, Plaintiffs will amend
 2 their responses as obligated to do, and Plaintiffs' counsel agrees to also reflect any amendments in the
 3 chart where this data will be compiled. Plaintiffs agreed to provide this table to Defendants by the next
 4 status report on Aug 2.

5 Plaintiffs maintain that their definition of Primary Devices and the Court's definition of the Main
 6 Devices are substantially the same, but understand that the Court directed Plaintiffs to include more than
 7 one device in their disclosure as long as it meets the Court's definition, which Plaintiffs have done.
 8 Plaintiffs agreed to review the list of Routine Devices identified in Plaintiff Fact Sheets, and indicate
 9 which Devices were improperly noted as Routine Devices and why.

10 Further, Plaintiffs have agreed to identify which of the Devices conform to the Court's definition
 11 of Main Devices, including both current and old devices. Hrg. Tr. at 28-29. On July 24 following the
 12 Parties' meet and confer, Plaintiffs provided a table identifying which devices identified in the Plaintiff
 13 Fact Sheets were incorrectly identified as Routine Devices. Defendants have asked Plaintiffs to amend
 14 their Plaintiff Fact Sheets to the extent they are no longer accurate, and Plaintiffs are considering that
 15 request.

16 As of yesterday, Plaintiffs had not provided any information concerning the operating system of
 17 the devices or the history of operating systems for each device. Plaintiffs have stated that any missing
 18 operating system information will be supplemented as the file-system extractions are completed on the
 19 other Main Devices.

20 **Plaintiffs' Additional Statement:**

21 Plaintiffs 'disagree with Defendants' insistence on attaching their proposed spreadsheet as an exhibit to
 22 this Status Report and any inference that Plaintiffs are somehow obligated to conform discovery responses
 23 to it. Plaintiffs further object to the use of Defendants' Table which seeks inappropriate discovery on
 24 discovery not contemplated by the Court or the Parties, and is unsupported by the caselaw.

25 **III. Forensic Imaging**

26 During the hearing and in the Joint Letter Brief, Plaintiffs stated that they conducted "a full-file
 27 forensic image" of specified devices. Letter Brief at 12; *see also* Hrg. Tr. 25:7.

Status Report

Plaintiffs represent that they are conducting full forensic imaging of all of Plaintiffs' devices and have provided additional information concerning devices that have been imaged to date.

Plaintiffs' July 19, 2024, Table (and their July 24, 2024 Updated Table) provide two columns of information labeled either (1) Cellebrite Advanced Logical Extraction or (2) Cellebrite File System Extraction, and note that some devices have been imaged using either of these protocols and others are "in queue." Plaintiffs are in the process of performing a File System Extraction as to all Main devices, including those for which they initially made an Advanced Logical Extraction.

Plaintiffs' July 19, 2024 Table indicated Plaintiffs performed a File System Extraction of eight devices for two Plaintiffs, six devices belonging to one Plaintiff, and two belonging to another Plaintiff.

Plaintiffs July 24, 2024 Table indicated Plaintiffs progress was the same as the July 19, 2024 Table.²

Defendants Additional Statement:

Defendants have two concerns. First, Plaintiffs represented to Defendants during the meet and confer process prior to July 11, and to the Court during the July 11 conference, that full forensic images had been captured for some of their devices. Tr. at 41:20-22. The tables produced by Plaintiffs do not indicate which imaging was performed when. Although Plaintiffs represent they are now performing full forensic imaging, Defendants are concerned about the pace of that imaging. Defendants requested information about the forensic imaging process on June 5, 6, and 2, prior to the July 11 hearing, sufficient to ensure the integrity of the imaging. Specifically, the identity of the ESI vendor who prepared the images; the date on which each image was obtained; a description of the protocol used to prepare the image; and confirmation that the bit-for-bit count between the device and image confirmed the integrity of the image.

See Correspondence from L. Bell to PSC Leads on June 5, 2024; Correspondence from T. Laddon to PSC Leads on June 6, 2024; Correspondence from A. Pierson to PSC Leads on June 21, 2024. Defendants did

² Plaintiffs have spent much of the last week finalizing an agreement and all attendant protocols for the purpose of engaging one digital forensic vendor to manage all file-system level imaging and post extraction work for Bellwether Plaintiffs' Main Devices. Plaintiffs anticipate imaging to resume next week.

1 not challenge the use of Plaintiffs' ESI vendor to prepare the images during the hearing on July 11 based
 2 on Plaintiffs' representations that information confirming the credibility of the imaging process would be
 3 voluntarily provided. Hrg. Tr. at 10:6-12.

4 Based on the information provided by Plaintiffs on July 19, it is clear that full-file system forensic
 5 imaging has not occurred for the Main Devices for multiple Plaintiffs. In addition, Plaintiffs' imaging
 6 process is proceeding slowly, and since the Parties' last status report to the Court it appears that no new
 7 devices have been forensically imaged. Defendants request that the Court require Plaintiffs to complete
 8 all full forensic imaging of the 27 devices identified in Plaintiffs' July 19, 2024 Table by August 5, and
 9 that Plaintiffs be required to provide – at a minimum – the date on which each image was obtained and a
 10 description of the protocol used to prepare the image.

11 Second, on July 26, Defendants wrote to Plaintiffs regarding significant concerns related to lost
 12 and destroyed devices identified through this process and during written discovery. Multiple of the Main
 13 Devices were not preserved after Plaintiffs' lawsuits were filed, including devices "lost," "discarded,"
 14 traded-in, or no longer in the possession of Plaintiff K. Craig, Plaintiff David Melton, and Plaintiff S.K.
 15 Defendants will meet and confer with Plaintiffs regarding the lost and destroyed devices and will detail
 16 further any unresolved issues in the DMC statement filed on August 2.

17 **Plaintiffs' Additional Statement:**

18 Plaintiffs do not agree with the Defendants statement and do not intend to address the many
 19 mischaracterizations within it any substantive way here. Plaintiffs have at all times worked diligently and
 20 in good faith toward providing Defendants the data they seek from the Main Devices.

21 Plaintiffs again reiterate their disagreement with Defendants' insistence on utilizing the Joint
 22 Status Report as a forum to air any and all discovery grievances that are unripe, are only tangentially
 23 attached to central issue of producing the file-system level device data, and which unnecessarily
 24 complicate and frustrate meaningful reporting on the actual task of producing relevant device data.

25 As such, Plaintiffs' respectfully ask the Court for an Order providing specific parameters for these
 26 Status Reports to ensure the Parties' updates are focused on demonstrating meaningful progress toward
 27 the production of this device data as expeditiously as possible.

1 **IV. Device Specific Information Identified by Plaintiffs for Production**

2 During the July 11 hearing, Plaintiffs represented that they would produce the following categories
 3 of information from the Plaintiff Devices:

- 4 a) app usage data;
- 5 b) browser history;
- 6 c) search data;
- 7 d) location data;
- 8 e) communication logs;
- 9 f) media files;
- 10 g) metadata;
- 11 h) application settings and preferences;
- 12 i) deleted data and artifacts;
- 13 j) device usage metrics;
- 14 k) health and fitness data;
- 15 l) third-party app data; and
- 16 m) notification data.

17 Hrg. Tr. at 26:4–21, 34:15–21; *see also* Order at 6:6–12.

18 **Status Report:** Plaintiffs have not yet provided this data, with the exception of identifying certain
 19 apps (described below) and bookmarks for two Plaintiff computers (Clevenger HP Pavillion, McNeal HP
 20 Pavillion) and applications on two other Plaintiff computers (Craig Lenovo and Melton Asus Vivobook).
 21 The Parties have not yet met and conferred to coordinate the involvement of forensics experts.
 22 During the Parties' July 24, 2024 meet and confer, Plaintiffs confirmed that all of this data will be provided
 23 from the Plaintiff Device Images following conferral of the Parties and their experts.

24 **Defendants Additional Statement:**

25 Defendants request that a rolling production of the above information begin immediately as
 26 Ordered by the Court. Order at 7. Defendants cannot schedule the depositions of Plaintiffs until they are

1 informed about the parameters of Plaintiffs' device usage from the above-promised data and are
 2 increasingly concerned about completing discovery on the schedule ordered by the Court.

3 **Plaintiffs' Additional Statement:**

4 A meet and confer is required to understand the scope and form of production of this data and
 5 Plaintiffs have offered to meet and confer on this specifically.

6 Plaintiffs again reiterate their disagreement with Defendants' insistence on utilizing the Joint
 7 Status Report as a forum to air any and all discovery grievances that are unripe, are only tangentially
 8 attached to central issue of producing the file-system level device data, and which unnecessarily
 9 complicate and frustrate meaningful reporting on the actual task of producing relevant device data.

10 As such, Plaintiffs' respectfully ask the Court for an Order providing specific parameters for these
 11 Status Reports to ensure the Parties' updates are focused on demonstrating meaningful progress toward
 12 the production of this device data as expeditiously as possible.

13 **V. List of All Current and Deleted Applications**

14 The Court ordered Plaintiffs to produce a full list and chart of all applications on the Plaintiff
 15 Devices, including "every single app on every single device." Hrg. Tr. at 35–36; Order at 5:28–6:2. This
 16 list includes applications deleted from the Plaintiff Devices. Hrg. Tr. at 26–27, 34 (Plaintiffs agree to
 17 provide "app usage data [and] deleted data and artifacts").

18 **Status Report:** Plaintiffs produced a list of the applications currently on all currently accessible
 19 Main Devices (23 out of 27) of the Plaintiffs' Main Devices along with an "identifier" on July 19.
 20 Information on "deleted data and artifacts" is only available from the file system level extraction and will
 21 be produced in accordance with whatever parameters are agreed upon in a substantive meet and confer on
 22 production of the device file system level data.

23 **VI. System Databases, Features, and Settings and Non-Word Searchable Files**

24 The Court ordered the Parties to meet and confer regarding other system log files and databases
 25 and other non-word searchable logs, files, metadata, and databases that may be present on the Plaintiff
 26 Devices that need to be produced for Defendants to understand the tapestry of each Plaintiff's device usage

1 – e.g., databases associated with device system settings and feature settings. *See generally* Tr. at 35–37,
 2 39, 47.

3 **Status Report:** Plaintiffs have not yet produced this information, but stated that this information
 4 will be produced from the Device Images as this data is only available from the file system level extraction
 5 and will be produced in accordance with whatever parameters are agreed upon in a substantive meet and
 6 confer on production of the device file system level data.

7 **Defendants Additional Statement:**

8 Defendants request that the Court order that Plaintiffs begin production of all non-text searchable
 9 databases immediately for all Plaintiffs for whom full forensic images have been completed.

10 **Plaintiffs' Additional Statement:**

11 A meet and confer is required to understand the scope and form of production of this data and
 12 Plaintiffs have offered to meet and confer on this specifically.

13 Plaintiffs again reiterate their disagreement with Defendants' insistence on utilizing the Joint
 14 Status Report as a forum to air any and all discovery grievances that are unripe, are only tangentially
 15 attached to central issue of producing the file-system level device data, and which unnecessarily
 16 complicate and frustrate meaningful reporting on the actual task of producing relevant device data.

17 As such, Plaintiffs' respectfully ask the Court for an Order providing specific parameters for these
 18 Status Reports to ensure the Parties' updates are focused on demonstrating meaningful progress toward
 19 the production of this device data as expeditiously as possible.

20 **VII. Authorizations**

21 During the hearing, the Parties briefly addressed the potential means of retrieving application data.
 22 Plaintiffs volunteered to "sign a release that would allow" Defendants to collect that information from
 23 third parties. Hrg. Tr. at 49. The Court ordered the parties to meet and confer on this topic. *Id.*

24 **Status Report:** The Parties have not yet met and conferred specifically related to the scope of
 25 relevant apps. Plaintiffs have agreed to see what kind of application data Plaintiffs are able to retrieve
 26 themselves and what kind of application data they may ask Defendants to retrieve by use of authorizations.
 27 Plaintiffs have agreed to consider providing additional information for each application (e.g., installation

1 date, and amount of application data) so that the Parties can explore the best means of collecting this
 2 information.

3 **VIII. School Devices**

4 Four Plaintiffs have acknowledged using School Devices to access Defendants' platforms (and
 5 presumably other sites and platforms) in their Plaintiff Fact Sheets. At least one other Plaintiff similarly
 6 disclosed accessing Defendants' platform from School Devices in interrogatory responses. Defendants
 7 have served subpoenas on Plaintiffs' schools to create images of those devices. Plaintiffs have objected
 8 to the collection of these Device images. The Parties are conferring in an effort to resolve this dispute,
 9 guided by the Court's order regarding forensic imaging of Plaintiffs' personal devices.

10 **IX. Supplemental Status Reports**

11 The Parties will provide the Court with a Supplemental Status Report regarding the above items
 12 on August 2, 2024

13
 14 Respectfully submitted,

15 DATED: July 26, 2024

16 By: /s/ Lexi J. Hazam

17
 18 LEXI J. HAZAM
 19 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
 20 BERNSTEIN, LLP
 21 275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR
 22 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339
 23 Telephone: 415-956-1000
 24 lhazam@lchb.com

25 PREVIN WARREN
 26 MOTLEY RICE LLC
 27 401 9th Street NW Suite 630
 Washington DC 20004
 Telephone: 202-386-9610
 28 pwarren@motleyrice.com

Co-Lead Counsel

CHRISTOPHER A. SEEGER
 SEEGER WEISS, LLP
 55 CHALLENGER ROAD, 6TH FLOOR
 RIDGEFIELD PARK, NJ 07660

1 Telephone: 973-639-9100
2 cseeger@seegerweiss.com
3

4 Counsel to Co-Lead Counsel
5

6 JENNIE LEE ANDERSON
7 **ANDRUS ANDERSON, LLP**
8 155 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 900
9 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
10 Telephone: 415-986-1400
11 jennie@andrusanderson.com
12

13 Liaison Counsel
14

15 EMILY C. JEFFCOTT
16 **MORGAN & MORGAN**
17 633 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 2652
18 LOS ANGELES, CA 90071
19 Telephone: 213-787-8590
20 ejeffcott@forthepeople.com
21

22 JOSEPH VANDZANDT
23 **BEASLEY ALLEN**
24 234 COMMERCE STREET
25 MONTGOMERY, LA 36103
26 Telephone: 334-269-2343
joseph.vanzandt@beasleyallen.com
27

28 Federal/State Liaisons
29

30 MATTHEW BERGMAN
31 GLENN DRAPER
32 **SOCIAL MEDIA VICTIMS LAW CENTER**
33 821 SECOND AVENUE, SUITE 2100
34 SEATTLE, WA 98104
35 Telephone: 206-741-4862
36 matt@socialmediavictims.org
37 glenn@socialmediavictims.org
38

39 JAMES J. BILSBORROW
40 **WEITZ & LUXENBERG, PC**
41 700 BROADWAY
42 NEW YORK, NY 10003
43 Telephone: 212-558-5500
44 jbilsborrow@weitzlux.com
45

46 JAYNE CONROY
47

SIMMONS HANLY CONROY, LLC
112 MADISON AVE, 7TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10016
Telephone: 917-882-5522
jconroy@simmonsfirm.com

ANDRE MURA
GIBBS LAW GROUP, LLP
1111 BROADWAY, SUITE 2100
OAKLAND, CA 94607
Telephone: 510-350-9717
amm@classlawgroup.com

**ALEXANDRA WALSH
WALSH LAW**
1050 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 500
Washington D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202-780-3014
awalsh@alexwalshlaw.com

MICHAEL M. WEINKOWITZ
LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN, LLP
510 WALNUT STREET
SUITE 500
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106
Telephone: 215-592-1500
mweinkowitz@lfsbalw.com

Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Leadership

RON AUSTIN
RON AUSTIN LAW
400 MANHATTAN BLVD.
HARVEY, LA 70058
Telephone: 504-227-8100
raustin@ronaustinlaw.com

PAIGE BOLDT
WALSH LAW
4 Dominion Drive, Bldg. 3, Suite 100
San Antonio, TX 78257
Telephone: 210-448-0500
PBoldt@alexwalshlaw.com

THOMAS P. CARTMELL
WAGSTAFF & CARTMELL LLP
4740 Grand Avenue, Suite 300

1 Kansas City, MO 64112
2 Telephone: 816-701-1100
3 tcartmell@wcllp.com

4 SARAH EMERY
5 **HENDY JOHNSON VAUGHN EMERY PSC**
6 600 WEST MAIN STREET, SUITE 100
7 LOUISVILLE, KY 40202
8 Telephone: 859-600-6725
9 semery@justicestartshere.com

10 CARRIE GOLDBERG
11 **C.A. GOLDBERG, PLLC**
12 16 Court St.
13 Brooklyn, NY 11241
14 Telephone: 646-666-8908
carrie@cagoldberglaw.com

15 RONALD E. JOHNSON, JR.
16 **HENDY JOHNSON VAUGHN EMERY PSC**
17 600 WEST MAIN STREET, SUITE 100
18 LOUISVILLE, KY 40202
19 Telephone: 859-578-4444
rjohnson@justicestartshere.com

20 SIN-TING MARY LIU
21 **AYLSTOCK WITKIN KREIS &**
22 **OVERHOLTZ, PLLC**
23 17 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
24 PENSACOLA, FL 32502
25 Telephone: 510-698-9566
26 mliu@awkolaw.com

27 JAMES MARSH
28 **MARSH LAW FIRM PLLC**
31 HUDSON YARDS, 11TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10001-2170
Telephone: 212-372-3030
jamesmarsh@marshlaw.com

1 JOSEPH E. MELTER
2 **KESSLER TOPAZ MELTZER & CHECK LLP**
3 280 KING OF PRUSSIA ROAD
4 RADNOR, PA 19087
5 Telephone: 610-667-7706
6 jmeltzer@ktmc.com

7 HILLARY NAPPI
8 **HACH & ROSE LLP**
9 112 Madison Avenue, 10th Floor
10 New York, New York 10016
11 Telephone: 212-213-8311
12 hnappi@hrsclaw.com

13 EMMIE PAULOS
14 **LEVIN PAPANTONIO RAFFERTY**
15 316 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET, SUITE 600
16 PENSACOLA, FL 32502
17 Telephone: 850-435-7107
18 epaulos@levinlaw.com

19 RUTH THI RIZKALLA
20 **THE CARLSON LAW FIRM, PC**
21 1500 ROSECRANS AVE., STE. 500
22 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
23 Telephone: 415-308-1915
24 rrizkalla@carlsonattorneys.com

25 ROLAND TELLIS
26 DAVID FERNANDES
27 **BARON & BUDD, P.C.**
28 15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1600
Encino, CA 91436
Telephone: 818-839-2333
rtellis@baronbudd.com
dfernandes@baronbudd.com

1 MELISSA YEATES
2 **KESSLER TOPAZ MELTZER & CHECK LLP**
3 280 KING OF PRUSSIA ROAD
4 RADNOR, PA 19087
5 Telephone: 610-667-7706
6 myeates@ktmc.com
7

8 DIANDRA "FU" DEBROSSE ZIMMERMANN
9 **DICELLO LEVITT**
10 505 20th St North
11 Suite 1500
12 Birmingham, Alabama 35203
13 Telephone: 205-855-5700
14 fu@dicelolevitt.com
15

16 Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Membership
17

18 *Attorneys for Individual Plaintiffs*
19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **PHILIP J. WEISER**
2 Attorney General
3 State of Colorado

4 /s/ Bianca E. Miyata
5 Bianca E. Miyata, CO Reg. No. 42012,
6 *pro hac vice*
7 Senior Assistant Attorney General
8 Lauren M. Dickey, CO Reg. No. 45773, *pro hac vice*
9 First Assistant Attorney General
10 Megan Paris Rundlet, CO Reg. No. 27474
11 Senior Assistant Solicitor General
12 Elizabeth Orem, CO Reg. No. 58309
13 Assistant Attorney General
14 Colorado Department of Law
15 Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center
16 Consumer Protection Section
17 1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
18 Denver, CO 80203
19 Phone: (720) 508-6651
20 bianca.miyata@coag.gov

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Colorado, ex rel.*
22 *Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General*

23 **ROB BONTA**
24 Attorney General
25 State of California

26 /s/ Megan O'Neill
27 Nicklas A. Akers (CA SBN 211222)
28 Senior Assistant Attorney General
Bernard Eskandari (SBN 244395)
Emily Kalanithi (SBN 256972)
Supervising Deputy Attorneys General
Nayha Arora (CA SBN 350467)
Megan O'Neill (CA SBN 343535)
Joshua Olszewski-Jubelirer (CA SBN 336428)
Marissa Roy (CA SBN 318773)
Brendan Ruddy (CA SBN 297896)
Deputy Attorneys General
California Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Phone: (415) 510-4400
Fax: (415) 703-5480

1 Megan.Oneill@doj.ca.gov

2 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the People of the State of*
3 *California*

4 **RUSSELL COLEMAN**
5 Attorney General
6 Commonwealth of Kentucky

7 /s/ J. Christian Lewis
8 J. Christian Lewis (KY Bar No. 87109),
9 *Pro hac vice*
10 Philip Heleringer (KY Bar No. 96748),
11 *Pro hac vice*
12 Zachary Richards (KY Bar No. 99209),
13 *Pro hac vice*
14 Daniel I. Keiser (KY Bar No. 100264),
15 *Pro hac vice*
16 Matthew Cocanougher (KY Bar No. 94292),
17 *Pro hac vice*
18 Assistant Attorneys General
19 1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200
20 Frankfort, KY 40601
21 CHRISTIAN.LEWIS@KY.GOV
22 PHILIP.HELERINGER@KY.GOV
23 ZACH.RICHARDS@KY.GOV
24 DANIEL.KEISER@KY.GOV
25 MATTHEW.COCAPOUGH@KY.GOV
26 Phone: (502) 696-5300
27 Fax: (502) 564-2698

28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the Commonwealth of Kentucky*

1 **MATTHEW J. PLATKIN**
2 Attorney General
3 State of New Jersey

4 /s/ Kashif T. Chand
5 Kashif T. Chand (NJ Bar No. 016752008),
6 *Pro hac vice*
7 Section Chief, Deputy Attorney General
8 Thomas Huynh (NJ Bar No. 200942017),
9 *Pro hac vice*
10 Assistant Section Chief, Deputy Attorney General
11 Verna J. Pradaxay (NJ Bar No. 335822021),
12 *Pro hac vice*

1 Mandy K. Wang (NJ Bar No. 373452021),
2 *Pro hac vice*

3 Deputy Attorneys General
4 New Jersey Office of the Attorney General,
5 Division of Law

6 124 Halsey Street, 5th Floor
7 Newark, NJ 07101

8 Tel: (973) 648-2052

9 Kashif.Chand@law.njoag.gov

10 Thomas.Huynh@law.njoag.gov

11 Verna.Pradaxay@law.njoag.gov

12 Mandy.Wang@law.njoag.gov

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiff New Jersey*
14 *Division of Consumer Affairs*

1 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

2 By: /s/ Ashley M. Simonsen
3 Ashley M. Simonsen, SBN 275203
4 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
5 1999 Avenue of the Stars
6 Los Angeles, CA 90067
7 Telephone: (424) 332-4800
8 Facsimile: + 1 (424) 332-4749
9 Email: asimonsen@cov.com

10 Phyllis A. Jones, *pro hac vice*
11 Paul W. Schmidt, *pro hac vice*
12 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
13 One City Center
14 850 Tenth Street, NW
15 Washington, DC 20001-4956
16 Telephone: + 1 (202) 662-6000
17 Facsimile: + 1 (202) 662-6291
18 Email: pajones@cov.com

19 *Attorney for Defendants Meta Platforms, Inc.*
20 *f/k/a Facebook, Inc.; Facebook Holdings,*
21 *LLC; Facebook Operations, LLC; Facebook*
22 *Payments, Inc.; Facebook Technologies, LLC;*
23 *Instagram, LLC; Siculus, Inc.; and Mark Elliot*
24 *Zuckerberg*

25 FAEGRE DRINKER LLP
26 By: /s/ Andrea Roberts Pierson
27 Andrea Roberts Pierson, *pro hac vice*
28 FAEGRE DRINKER LLP
1 300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2500
2 Indianapolis, IN 46204
3 Telephone: + 1 (317) 237-0300
4 Facsimile: + 1 (317) 237-1000
5 Email: andrea.pierson@faegredrinker.com
6 Email: amy.fiterman @faegredrinker.com

7 Amy R. Fiterman, *pro hac vice*
8 FAEGRE DRINKER LLP
9 2200 Wells Fargo Center
10 90 South Seventh Street
11 Minneapolis, MN 55402
12 Telephone: +1 (612) 766-7768
13 Facsimile: +1 (612) 766-1600
14 Email: amy.fiterman@faegredrinker.com

1 Geoffrey Drake, *pro hac vice*
2 KING & SPALDING LLP
3 1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1600
4 Atlanta, GA 30309
5 Tel.: 404-572-4600
6 Email: gdrake@kslaw.com
7 Email: dmattern@kslaw.com

8 David Mattern, *pro hac vice*
9 KING & SPALDING LLP
10 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 900
11 Washington, D.C. 20006
12 Telephone: +1 (202) 626-2946
13 Email: dmattern@kslaw.com

14 *Attorneys for Defendants TikTok Inc. and ByteDance*
15 *Inc.*

16 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSEN LLP
17 By: /s/ Jonathan H. Blavin
18 Jonathan H. Blavin, SBN 230269
19 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
20 560 Mission Street, 27th Floor
21 San Francisco, CA 94105-3089
22 Telephone: (415) 512-4000
23 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077
24 Email: jonathan.blavin@mto.com

25 Rose L. Ehler (SBN 29652)
26 Victoria A. Degtyareva (SBN 284199)
27 Laura M. Lopez, (SBN 313450)
28 Ariel T. Teshuva (SBN 324238)
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3426
Telephone: (213) 683-9100
Facsimile: (213) 687-3702
Email: rose.ehler@mto.com
Email: victoria.degtyareva@mto.com
Email: Ariel.Teshuva@mto.com

25 Lauren A. Bell (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
26 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
27 601 Massachusetts Ave., NW St.,
28 Suite 500 E
Washington, D.C. 20001-5369

1 Telephone: (202) 220-1100
2 Facsimile: (202) 220-2300
3 Email: lauren.bell@mto.com

4 *Attorneys for Defendant Snap Inc.*

5 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
6 Professional Corporation
7 By: /s/ Brian M. Willen
8 Brian M. Willen (*pro hac vice*)
9 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
10 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
11 New York, New York 10019
12 Telephone: (212) 999-5800
13 Facsimile: (212) 999-5899
14 Email: bwillen@wsgr.com

15 Lauren Gallo White (SBN 309075)
16 Samantha A. Machock (SBN 298852)
17 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
18 One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, Suite 3300
19 San Francisco, CA 94105
20 Telephone: (415) 947-2000
21 Facsimile: (415) 947-2099
22 Email: lwhite@wsgr.com
23 Email: smachock@wsgr.com

24 Christopher Chiou (SBN 233587)
25 Matthew K. Donohue (SBN 302144)
26 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
27 953 East Third Street, Suite 100
28 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (323) 210-2900
Facsimile: (866) 974-7329
Email: cchiou@wsgr.com
Email: mdonohue@wsgr.com

22 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and Google*
23 *LLC*

24 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
25 By: /s/ Joseph G. Petrosinelli
26 Joseph G. Petrosinelli (*pro hac vice*)
jpetrosinelli@wc.com
27 Ashley W. Hardin (*pro hac vice*)
ahardin@wc.com
680 Maine Avenue, SW

1 Washington, DC 20024
2 Telephone.: 202-434-5000
3 Fax: 202-434-5029

4
5 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and Google*
6 *LLC*

7
8 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
9 By: /s/ Yarden R. Zwang-Weissman
10 Yarden R. Zwang-Weissman (SBN 247111)
11 300 South Grand Avenue, 22nd Floor
12 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132
13 Tel.: 213.612.7238
14 Email: yardena.zwang-weissman@morganlewis.com

15 Brian Ercole (*pro hac vice*)
16 600 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1600
17 Miami, FL 33131-3075
18 Tel.: 305.415.3416
19 Email: brian.ercole@morganlewis.com

20 Stephanie Schuster (*pro hac vice*)
21 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
22 NW Washington, DC 20004-2541
23 Tel.: 202.373.6595
24 Email: stephanie.schuster@morganlewis.com

25
26 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and Google*
27 *LLC*

1 **ATTESTATION**
2

3 I, Andrea R. Pierson, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to
4 the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.
5

6 Dated: July 26, 2024
7

8 By: /s/ Andrea R. Pierson
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28